

TRANSMITTAL SLIP		DATE 14 MAR 80
TO: C/MSB DD/DDP D/DDP		
ROOM NO.	BUILDING	
REMARKS: For your information and review. I plan to submit this to the DDA on Monday (17th) as requested. Lew - looks ok to me. Lew Bruce: this		
FROM: [Signature]		
ROOM NO.	BUILDING	EXTENSION

FORM NO. 241
1 FEB 55REPLACES FORM 36-8
WHICH MAY BE USED.

(47)

STATINTL

File: SAFE

14 March 1980

STATINTL

NOTE TO:

FROM:

Attached is our draft answer to SSC #9. I would like to see what the Agency sends out so that I can field questions later.

Also attached is the DIA's question F.3 which should be forwarded to the Comptroller's office for information purposes. Our draft will be sent to DIA for the same reason.

STATINTL

STATINTL

Senate Select Committee Question No. 9

STATINTL

Last year the joint CIA/DIA analyst computer support system known as SAFE was placed on a design-to-cost basis, with an overall funding limitation of [REDACTED]. Of this amount, [REDACTED] was allocated for the CIA portion.

-- What changes have occurred during the past year with respect to schedule, cost, or performance of the SAFE system?

-- What additional functions have had to be deferred or eliminated from the CIA portion of the SAFE system in order to meet the design-to-cost funding limitation?

-- How will the loss of these capabilities impact the benefits that were originally anticipated from the SAFE system?

STATINTL

STATINTL

RESPONSE TO SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE QUESTION NO. 9

(Response due to ODP for submission to DDA on 14 March 1980)

The allocation of the overall funding for the CIA's portion of the SAFE Project's budget was set at [REDACTED] through IOC in 1984. This allocation includes [REDACTED] for development and acquisition of the CIA system and one-half of the [REDACTED] allocated for integrating the CIA and DIA systems.

RESPONSE TO SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE QUESTION NO. 9 (Cont'd)

No schedule or cost changes have occurred during the past year. The contract required that the SAFE Project Plan, Management Plan, and Financial Plan submitted to the Government in December 1979 be aligned to the schedule and the funding limitation for the joint project.

While all of the documented requirements will be included in the system design and reviewed at the System Design Review in July 1980, costs and requirements tradeoffs will occur prior to the Preliminary Design Review in January 1981. These tradeoffs will determine which of the requirements will be selected for deferred implementation beyond the SAFE System Acquisition Phase contract. This process is planned so that all requirements can be accommodated by the design and be implemented in phases without significant redesign and operational interruption. This process is required because all of the documented requirements cannot be implemented within existing funding limitations.

STATINTL

Priorities were developed in both Agencies such that functions can be fitted to the budget. Some compromise was made initially in that [] will be provided for initial operation, and storage for two years of data will be provided rather than ten years. Additional candidate functions

RESPONSE TO SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE QUESTION NO. 9 (Cont'd)

for deferral to reduce cost were developed by the contractor in accordance with Agency priorities. All functions will be carried through the design process, during which the Government will determine which functions will be deferred or eliminated to reduce cost. The user community will participate in these decisions to ensure that the utility of the system is minimally impaired.

Preliminary agreement has already been reached on some functions which have been simplified or found of marginal utility. For example, text search of annotations, suspended profiles and unique handling of document segments will be deferred with very little reduction in utility while such functions as teleconferencing, display data sorting and hierarchical file manipulation will not. Again, all decisions will be made prior to preliminary design review in January 1981.

The loss of capability to date has been in the number of users serviced and the total data storage initially available. These are capabilities which may be added at a later date as their value dictates, without system outage.

QUESTION: F.3. What are reasonable expectations about cost, schedule and performance problems we will encounter with DIA's and CIA's new SAFE computer system?

ANSWER:

- o No schedule or cost changes have occurred during the past fiscal year and none are anticipated for FY-80.

STATINTL

- Contract with ☐ required Project Management and Financial plans are aligned with Government's schedule and cost limitations.
- o Documented performance requirements are being included in total system design
 - The System Functional Specification (Jan 80) includes all CIA and DIA requirements documented in Consolidated SAFE Requirements Document (CSRD)
 - Performance requirements will further be reviewed at System Design Review in July 1980
 - Users in CIA and DIA have ordered the priority of requirements

- Total System Design will be carried through Preliminary Design Review (PDR) in January 1981 so that significant redesign will not be required when adding requirements of lower priority after system IOC in FY-84
- Preliminary candidates for cost tradeoff analysis have been identified in coordination with users so that highest priority requirements will be maintained. Cost tradeoffs will continue through PDR to keep project costs within budgetary constraints
- Early candidates for deferral beyond IOC are:
sophisticated graphics terminals, transparent interfaces with total DoDIIS Community, conversion of all DIAOLS Files (about 50% will be converted to SAFE), additional mass storage and 200 additional terminals
- Funding has been identified for FY-85 and FY-86 to provide for capabilities that cannot be implemented at IOC
- o DIA-SAFE planning activity and IOC are closely tied to the Defense Intelligence Analysis Center (new DIA building) and delay in the facility could cause a delay in SAFE IOC.

- o The data base conversion, transition and cut-over from DIAOLS to DIA-SAFE is considered the most difficult and critical portion of the SAFE project. Careful planning by the contractor and close scrutiny by the Government will reduce risk in this area.

STATINTL

10 MAR 1980

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Processing, ODP
Chief, Special Projects Staff
Deputy Chief, Special Projects Staff

FROM:

[REDACTED]
Acting Director of Data Processing

SUBJECT: SAFE and Ruffing Centers Integration
Concept

REFERENCE: Memo to DC/SPS fm D/ODP dtd 27 Feb 80,
same subject

1. Attached is the final version of Section I of the concept paper on SAFE and Ruffing Center Integration as we agreed to in our meeting on 7 March 1980. It represents a first and significant step forward in the development of an integrated plan which is essential to our success in this endeavor.

2. The draft paper on how SAFE will operate at IOC is to be prepared by SPS by the end of March and will form the basis for a transition plan of responsibilities and people from SPS to Processing (Section II of the paper on SAFE and Ruffing Center Integration). We will meet again during the first week of April to agree on the specifics.

STATINTL

Att:

1. Reference
2. Section I of SAFE and Ruffing Center Integration
Concept

cc: D/ODP

STATINTL

O/D/ODP [REDACTED] ee/3-10-80

Distribution:

- 1 - ea adse 2 - ODP Registry
1 - D/ODP 2 - O/D/ODP
1 - ~~Approved~~

27 FEB 1980

MEMORANDUM FOR: [REDACTED]

STATINTL

Deputy Chief, Special Projects Staff

FROM:

Bruce T. Johnson
Director of Data Processing

SUBJECT:

SAFE and Ruffing Center Integration Concept

REFERENCE:

Your memo, same subject, dtd 30 Jan 80
(SAF E938-30)

1. I have reviewed your draft concept paper on integrating SAFE and the Ruffing Center, and found it very close to what we need as a base point for future planning. I think that the two main points in your statement of the basic goal call for a third, closely related point, namely, that SAFE users should have access to other ODP services. You had referred to this need in your "Objectives" section, but I think it is important enough to be part of the goal. Your third sub-goal, having to do with minimal disruption when SAFE is implemented, seems less a goal than an objective, and rather self-evident. I have dropped it from my revision of your draft, but will not protest if it is revived as an objective.

2. The other changes I have suggested are largely editorial, but I have stopped short of your last section on "Issue Resolution", believing this to be a legitimate aspect of what you refer to as Section II (Integration Plan.) I have added one more issue, on NFAC's role, and another objective, "G", on the need to protect SAFE service from degradation when other users gain access. I moved your objective "H" to "B", combined your "D" and "E" into one paragraph ("E"), and, as I say, editorialized a bit. But the principal points you have made are, I believe, intact.

3. I will be away at a seminar for the next two weeks, but I have asked [REDACTED] to convene a meeting at which the final version of Section I can be hammered out and plans made for our joint attack on the development of Section II.

/s/ Bruce T. Johnson

Bruce T. Johnson

Attachment:

Revised Draft.

cc: DD/ODP w/att.

DD/P/ODP w/att.

C/SPS w/att.

STATINTL

SAFE AND RUFFING CENTERS INTEGRATION CONCEPT
30 JANUARY 1980

SECTION I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE - This document introduces the concept for incorporating the CIA SAFE System as an operational entity of the Office of Data Processing (ODP). Section I attempts to delineate the goals of the integration concept and identify objectives that should permit the goals to be attained. In addition, it attempts to identify issues that must be resolved that have resulted from the development of the integration concept, its goals and objectives. Section I does not address how the objectives should be attained. This subject will be addressed in Section II (Integration Plan) which will be developed after Section I has been coordinated and agreed to by the concerned principals of ODP.

1.2 GOAL - The goal is to incorporate the services provided by the CIA SAFE and Ruffing Computer Centers in a manner which ensures that:

- ° The SAFE System satisfies the documented functional and performance requirements of NFAC and DIA;
- ° SAFE users have ready access to the other non-SAFE services provided by ODP;
- ° The SAFE capabilities become available to other (non-SAFE) users;

1.3 OBJECTIVES - The following objectives are delineated in an attempt to arrive at means to attain the stated goal:

- A. Consistent interfaces should be provided to permit users to: (1) select ODP services; (2) authenticate the user's identify; and (3) access the SAFE and Ruffing Computer Centers' functional facilities.

- B. The SAFE services should be provided through a common user interface so the user can view them as services that are compatible with the other ADP services, such as: word processing, linkage to ETEC for finished production, generalized time-sharing, batch processing, modeling and simulation tools, generalized data base management support, etc.
- C. A standard facility should be provided to permit data transfers between the SAFE and Ruffing Computer Centers.
- D. Classified and unclassified computer output generated by the SAFE and Ruffing Computer Centers' systems should be delivered through common facilities and procedures.
- E. Operations staffing and systems engineering support (software and hardware) should be provided in ways which ensure that SAFE performance and growth requirements are met.
- F. A clearly defined division of support responsibilities between ODP and NFAC should be developed.
- G. SAFE should be incorporated as a dedicated facility for NFAC with plans developed to subsequently replicate or extend these capabilities as an increased service for other non-users.
- H. Plans should be developed that will allow common facilities to be phased into service to satisfy common user requirements.

1.4 ISSUES - The following issues were identified as a result of the delineation of the goal and objectives cited above:

- A. How should organizational staffing plans be developed to satisfy the system programming, system engineering, data base management and administration, and computer operation support that will be required for the SAFE System and new capabilities brought about as a result of the SAFE System?
- B. What should NFAC support responsibilities be?